DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 715 EA 001 925

By-Frasure, Kenneth

Perspectives Concerning In-Service Education for Educational Administrators.

Council for Administrative Leadership, Albany, N.Y.
Pub Date 14 Jun 66
Note-18p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors-*Attitudes, *Educational Administration, Environmental Influences, Experience, *Graduate Professors, *Inservice Education, Perception, *School Superintendents

The usefulness of inservice opportunities for school administrators have sometimes been perceived differently by professors and superintendents. To explore whether these differences might be related to such things as years of service, metropolitan or nonmetropolitan location, and professional participation in a superintendency preparation program, a list of 20 ways for universities to serve practicing school superintendents was mailed to 140 professors of administration and 140 superintendents in New York State. The order of their preferences for the 20 items was recorded along with differences in perception that resulted from the above items. While there was general agreement among professors and administrators on the rank order of the items, results tend to confirm the idea that perception differs between individuals and groups as they view a process from different environmental positions. More experienced professors and superintendents tend to agree more fully than less experienced members of these groups. Younger professors, those from schools offering a superintendency program, and those from urban areas were found to place relatively more emphasis on administrative theory. Further study is needed to determine reasons for the discrepancies in points of view. (TT)

CAUL
COUNCIL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

PERSPECTIVES CONCERNING IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

by
KENNETH FRASURE
JUNE 1966

Background of the Study

For many years practicing administrators and professors of educational administration have recognized the value of in-service education. However, questions have been raised as to the value of specific in-service opportunities.

The 1963 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators stated the situation as follows:

> *"There is a great variation in the character and intensity of in-service programs and wide diversity in the resources used and in the problems that come to the forefront. But wherever one looks, whether it be in the teeming cities, in quiet country towns, or in the wide open spaces of the prairies, there is need for more understanding in every facet of school administration."

Statements like the one cited lead to speculation as to how universities may best help to meet this need. It has been observed that professors and administrators have sometimes differed in their views as to which in-service opportunities are of most worth. At other times professors have disagreed within their groups and superintendents have also differed with each other. These variations have led to uncertainty as to the basis for the differences. In recent years some attention has been given to the area of perception as a basis for these disagreements.

Ittelson** has indicated that perception in a situation is an effort to predict the uncertain. He further identifies perception as a process by which a person from his behavioral center "attributes significances to his particular environmental situation."

EA 001 925

*American Association of School Administrators, Inservice Education for School Administration. The Association, Washington, D.C. 1963. P. 140

**W. H. Ittelson and H. Cantril, Perception, A Transactional Approach, New York, Random House, 1954, P. 23.

In support of Ittelson's position those interested in providing in-service opportunities for administrators have indicated that differences in perception among professors and superintendents may be related to such things as years of service and type of institutional environment. Some individuals have suggested that professors and superintendents in metropolitan areas perceive in-service education in a different way from those in other areas. It has been stated that professors in established programs preparing superintendents react differently from professors in university programs where the superintendency certificate is not offered.

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of the writer to determine the order of preference among twenty suggested ways for universities to best serve practicing school superintendents in New York State as perceived by professors of administration and superintendents of schools. It was a further purpose to note the differences in perception, if any, that resulted from years of service and metropolitan or non-metropolitan location. In addition a check was made as to the reactions of professors of administration working in institutions with superintendency preparation programs and as to the reactions of professors of administration in institutions without superintendency programs. The purposes have been restated as questions as follows:

1. Is the perception of New York State professors concerning the rank order of value of twenty ways in which professors of educational administration may best serve practicing administrators related to such factors as years of service, upstate or metropolitan location and employment in an institution offering a superintendency preparation program or employment in an institution not offering a superintendency program?

2. Is the perception of superintendents in New York State concerning the rank order of value of twenty ways in which professors of educational administration may serve practicing administrators related to factors such as years of service as an administrator and employment in an upstate or metropolitan institution?

3. Is the perception of professors and superintendents in New York State in agreement concerning the rank order of value of twenty ways for professors of educational administration to serve administrators as a total group and as subgroups according to such factors as years of service, upstate or metropolitan location and professional participation in an institutional program preparing superintendents of schools?

Definition of Terms

The professors of administration in New York State whose opinions were solicited, were from the 1965 mailing list of the Collegiate Association of Professors of Administration.

The Superintendents of schools were selected on a random basis from the 1965 American Association of School Administrators list of New York State members. Upstate professors and superintendents were those outside of New York City, Long Island and Westchester County.

Metropolitan professors and superintendents included professors and superintendents employed in Westchester County, New York City, and Long Island.

Universities with superintendency programs included those recognized by the New York State Education Department, Cornell University, New York University, State University of New York at Albany, State University of New York at Buffalo, St. John's University, Syracuse University, Teachers College of Columbia University, and the University of Rochester.

Universities without superintendency programs included all CADEA member colleges and universities except those listed in the preceding statement. These were: Colgate University; Fordham University; Hofstra University; Queens College; St. Bonaventure University; St. Lawrence University; Siena College; and State University Colleges at Brockport, Buffalo, Cortland, Fredonia, Geneseo, New Paltz, Oneonta, Oswego, Plattsburg, and Potsdam.

Procedures used

The twenty items used in this study were based upon a list prepared by a special interest group at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration at Humboldt, California in 1965 as reviewed by five professors of administration and by two graduate classes studying administration.

The twenty items (Figure 1) with coded response postal cards (Figure 2) were sent to one hundred and forty professors of administration as listed on the mailing list of the Collegiate Association for the Development of Educational Administration and to one hundred and forty superintendents or supervising principals in New York State who were listed in the 1965 directory of members of the American Association of School Administrators. The names were selected as follows: The first name on the list, the last name on the list, the middle name on the list, the middle name between the first selection and the middle choice, the middle name between the last name on the list and the middle name first selected. This process of selecting the middle name was repeated until one hundred and forty administrators were chosen.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
Albany, New York 12203
School of Education

Dear

The accompanying statements were developed as an outgrowth of discussions in the 1965 National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. In order to check the relative importance of each of these statements, please list what you consider to be the five most helpful activities for practicing administrators. Place the number of each item selected on the accompanying post card. In addition, please list the five least important items in terms of their helpfulness to practicing administrators. Individual responses will be reported anonymously.

If you desire a copy of the results of this study, you should place a check in the appropriate place on the post card. Since the card is coded you will not need to sign your name. Your prompt return of the post card will be most helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth Frasure
Professor of Education

KF/mab
enc.

FIGURE I

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY RESPONDENTS

Professors of Educational Administration may best serve practicing administrators, if they:

1. Provide group conferences of individual administrators with similar administrative responsibilities. (Elem. Prin.)
2. Build a ready reference library containing information relative to administrative problems for area administrators.
3. Set up meetings with a group of administrators from the same school system with differing responsibilities. (Supt., Asst. Supt., Director, Principal).
4. Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and practice in administration.
5. Work with special purpose committees of practicing administrators for the improvement of practice. (Committee on Staff Selection).
6. Issue bulletins of information helpful to administrators.
7. Involve practicing administrators in research problems of a practical nature.
8. Direct administrators in a program of professional reading.
9. Provide a personnel file of employable young administrators.
10. Take over administrative posts in schools while school administrators are on leave for study.
11. Develop an area administrative resource and consultant list.
12. Speak out in area meetings and in the press concerning administrative problems and their solution.
13. Provide individual consultant services for administrators.
14. Provide administrative interns to work with administrators.
15. Study the application of administrative theory to situations.
16. Provide a research service for writing grant proposals.
17. Work out theoretical constructs based on administrative theory.
18. Involve a team of professors to work with an administrator in a school system over a period of a year or two.
19. Ask administrators to teach an occasional course or class period.
20. Set up school visitation and post-visitation conferences with school administrators.

FIGURE 2

CODED RESPONSE CARD
(coding omitted)

RESPONSE CARD

I have been a practicing administrator or professor:

_____	_____	_____	_____
Less than 10 yrs.	10-20 yrs.	20-30 yrs.	Over 30 yrs.

The most helpful items are as follows: (not necessarily in order of importance)

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

The least helpful items are as follows: (not necessarily in order of importance)

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

I desire a copy of the results of the study: _____YES _____NO

Procedures used (continued)

The responses were scored by assigning a score of positive one to each item listed by a respondent as being among the five most helpful ways of serving administrators. A score of negative one was given to each item listed as one of the five least helpful to administrators. For each item, the negatives were subtracted from the positives and a total positive or negative score was obtained. The items were then ranked in terms of total scores for each group.

Presentation of the findings

The tabulation of responses has been placed in rank order in three tables. These tables have been put in the same order as the questions to be answered. In Table I the results of the return by professors have been presented. In Table II the returns from the superintendents have been recorded. Table III is a composite showing all of the returns in one table.

Table I shows that of one hundred and forty professors, one hundred and four returned the post cards and contains the number of responses within each category. The item numbers along the side of the page refer to the twenty items in Figure 1 by number of the item. The columns indicate the rank order of each item by category of professor.

In the following presentation the writer has discussed the findings related to Question 1 on an item by item basis from Figure 1.

Item 1. Provide group conferences of individual administrators with similar administrative responsibilities (Elem. Prin.)
Professors in a university without a program preparing administrators for the superintendency ranked this item second while professors working in programs preparing candidates for superintendency ranked it eighth. It may also be noted that older professors (those with more than twenty years' experience) and upstate professors rated this item second whereas metropolitan professors ranked it sixth.

Item 2. Build a ready reference library containing information relative to administrative problems for area administrators.

Upstate professors and professors with over thirty years' experience ranked this item fourteenth and fifteenth. Metropolitan professors and professors not in universities with programs preparing for the superintendency ranked the item nineteenth.

Item 3. Set up meetings with a group of administrators from the same school system with differing responsibilities (Supt., Asst. Supt., Director, Principal).

Professors with twenty to thirty years' experience ranked this item eighth.

Professors in universities with superintendency programs ranked it thirteenth.

Item 4. Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and practice in administration.

While this item was ranked third by professors with less than ten years' of experience, it was ranked first or second by other professorial groups.

T A B L E I

RANK OF ITEMS BY PROFESSORS

	Professors rating	Under 10 years' experience	10-20 years' experience	20-30 years' experience	Over 30 years' experience	Upstate Professors	Metropolitan Professors	Professors in Universities with superintendency programs	Professors not in universities with superintendency programs
Mailed	140	--	--	--	--	101	39		
Returned	104	38	38	19	9	77	27	34	70
Item #									
1*	4	4	5	2	2	3	6	8	2
2	17	17	18	18	14	15	19	17	19
3	11	12	10	8	9	11	9	13	9
4	1	3	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
5	2	5	2	1	4	3	3	3	4
6	14	14	14	12	11	14	12	13	13
7	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	3
8	20	20	20	20	16	20	19	18	20
9	15	17	15	14	14	16	16	15	18
10	19	16	16	19	18	17	18	19	16
11	10	11	9	10	9	9	14	11	10
12	16	15	19	14	16	19	13	16	16
13	6	6	3	5	11	5	8	7	5
14	7	7	7	5	4	7	7	4	7
15	5	1	5	10	4	6	1	1	6
16	13	12	13	12	13	13	14	12	13
17	12	9	12	16	18	12	11	10	12
18	8	8	8	5	4	8	4	6	8
19	18	19	16	17	18	17	17	19	15
20	9	10	11	8	2	10	10	9	10

*All Columns refer to rank order of preference.

Item 5. Work with special purpose committees of practicing administrators for the improvement of practice. (Committee on Staff Selection).

Professors with less than ten years' experience rated this item fifth but professors with twenty to thirty years' experience ranked it first.

Item 6. Issue bulletins of information helpful to administrators.

Professors with over thirty years' experience rated it slightly better than did other groups.

Item 7. Involve practicing administrators in research problems of a practical nature. Professors with less than ten years' experience and upstate professors were slightly more favorable than were other groups.

Item 8. Direct administrators in a program of professional reading.

This item was rated sixteenth by professors with over thirty years' experience but all other groups rated it last or close to last.

Item 9. Provide a personnel file of employable young administrators.

The item was rated eighteenth by professors not in universities with superintendency programs and fourteenth by professors with twenty or more years of experience.

Item 10. Take over administrative posts in schools while school administrators are on leave for study.

Professors with less than twenty years' experience and professors not in universities with superintendency programs rated this item sixteenth but those with over thirty years' experience and professors in universities with superintendency programs ranked the item nineteenth.

Item 11. Develop an area administrative resource and consultant list.

This item was ranked ninth by professors with ten to twenty years' experience and with over thirty years' experience whereas it was ranked fourteenth by metropolitan professors.

Item 12. Speak out in area meetings and in the press concerning administrative problems and their solution.

Although this item was ranked thirteenth by metropolitan professors, it was ranked nineteenth by professors with ten to twenty years' experience and by upstate professors.

Item 13. Provide individual consultant services for administrators.

Professors with from ten to twenty years' experience rated this item as third but professors with over thirty years' experience ranked this item eleventh.

Item 14. Provide administrative interns to work with administrators.

Professors with over thirty years' experience and professors in universities with superintendency programs ranked this item fourth whereas most other groups rated it seventh.

Item 15. Study the application of administrative theory to situations.

The item was ranked first by professors under ten years of experience, by metropolitan professors and by professors in universities with superintendency programs. It was ranked tenth by professors with from twenty to thirty years of experience.

Item 16. Provide a research service for writing grant proposals.

All groups ranked it twelfth or thirteenth except the metropolitan professors who rated it fourteenth.

Item 17. Work out theoretical constructs based on administrative theory.

Professors having less than ten years of experience rated this item ninth whereas professors with over thirty years' experience ranked it eighteenth.

Item 18. Involve a team of professors to work with an administrator in a school system over a period of a year or two.

Metropolitan professors and professors with over thirty years' experience ranked this item fourth. Upstate professors, professors with less than twenty years' experience and professors not in universities with superintendency programs ranked it eighth.

Item 19. Ask administrators to teach an occasional course or class period.

This item was rated nineteenth by professors with less than ten years' experience and by professors in universities with superintendency programs. It was ranked fifteenth by professors not in universities with superintendency programs.

Item 20. Set up school visitation and post-visitation conferences with school administrators.

Professors with over thirty years' experience ranked this item second whereas no other category of professor ranked it higher than eight.

Question 2. Is the perception of superintendents in New York State concerning the rank order of value of twenty ways in which professors of educational administration may serve practicing administrators related to such factors as years of service as an administrator and employment in an upstate or metropolitan location?

Table II shows that one hundred and forty superintendents were sent copies of the materials. It indicates that one hundred and fourteen superintendents returned the postal card. It also lists the number of responses within each category. The item numbers are along the side of the page and refer to the twenty items in Figure 1 by number of the item. The columns indicate the rank order of each item by category of superintendent.

In the following presentation the writer has discussed the findings related to Question 2 on an item by item basis from Figure 1.

T A B L E II

RANK OF ITEMS BY SUPERINTENDENTS

	Superintendents' rating	Under 10 years' experience	10-20 years' experience	20-30 years' experience	Over 30 years' experience	Upstate superintendents	Metropolitan superintendents
Mailed	140	--	--	--	--	101	39
Returned	114	14	47	38	15	83	27
Question #							
1*	3	1	2	4	3	2	5
2	16	12	15	16	17	16	14
3	15	17	17	12	7	15	15
4	1	3	1	3	3	3	1
5	4	1	5	1	9	5	1
6	9	3	9	14	9	7	15
7	6	6	6	5	5	6	3
8	20	12	19	19	19	19	20
9	12	17	12	8	15	13	10
10	19	17	20	17	16	19	17
11	7	6	8	8	12	8	6
12	14	17	13	14	9	14	11
13	2	3	4	2	1	1	8
14	5	12	3	6	1	4	7
15	11	9	11	7	18	12	12
16	13	15	13	12	13	11	18
17	18	15	18	17	19	17	18
18	7	11	6	10	5	10	4
19	17	9	16	19	13	18	13
20	9	6	9	11	7	9	8

*All Columns refer to rank order of preference.

Item 1. Provide group conferences of individual administrators with similar administrative responsibilities. (Elem. Prin.)

Superintendents with less than ten years' experience rated this item first whereas metropolitan superintendents placed it fifth.

Item 2. Build a ready reference library containing information relative to administrative problems for area administrators.

Superintendents with less than ten years' experience ranked this item twelfth whereas it was rated seventeenth by those with more than thirty years' experience.

Item 3. Set up meetings with a group of administrators from the same school system with differing responsibilities. (Supt., Asst. Supt., Director, Principal)

While this item was ranked seventh by superintendents with over thirty years' experience, it was rated seventeenth by those with less than twenty years' experience.

Item 4. Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and practice in administration.

This item was ranked either first or third by all categories of superintendents.

Item 5. Work with special purpose committees of practicing administrators for the improvement of practice. (Committee on Staff Selection)

Superintendents with over thirty years' experience ranked this item ninth whereas it was ranked first by superintendents with less than ten years' experience, with from twenty to thirty years' experience and by metropolitan superintendents.

Item 6. Issue bulletins of information helpful to administrators.

Superintendents with less than ten years' experience rated this item third whereas fourteenth by professors with over thirty years' experience and fifteenth by metropolitan superintendents.

Item 7. Involve practicing administrators in research problems of a practical nature. This item was ranked third by metropolitan superintendents and fifth or sixth by all other categories of superintendents.

Item 8. Direct administrators in a program of professional reading.

Whereas the superintendents with less than ten years' experience ranked this item twelfth, it was ranked nineteenth or twentieth by other categories of superintendents.

Item 9. Provide a personnel file of employable young administrators.

This item was ranked eighth by superintendents with twenty to thirty years' experience and seventeenth by those with less than ten years' experience.

Item 10. Take over administrative posts in schools while school administrators are on leave for study.

This item was ranked sixteenth by superintendents with over thirty years' experience and twentieth by superintendents with ten to twenty years' experience.

Item 11. Develop an area administrative resource and consultant list.

This item was ranked sixth by superintendents with less than ten years' experience and by metropolitan superintendents. It was ranked twelfth by superintendents with over thirty years of experience.

Item 12. Speak out in area meetings and in the press concerning administrative problems and their solution.

Superintendents with over thirty years' experience ranked this item ninth and those with less than ten years' experience ranked it seventeenth.

Item 13. Provide individual consultant services for administrators.

Metropolitan superintendents ranked this item eighth whereas those with over thirty years' experience and upstate superintendents ranked it first.

Item 14. Provide administrative interns to work with administrators.

Rated first by superintendents with over thirty years' experience it was rated twelfth by those with less than ten years' experience.

Item 15. Study the application of administrative theory to situations.

Superintendents with twenty to thirty years' experience ranked this item seventh whereas those with over thirty years ranked it eighteenth.

Item 16. Provide a research service for writing grant proposals.

This item was ranked twelfth by superintendents with twenty to thirty years of experience and eighteenth by metropolitan superintendents.

Item 17. Work out theoretical constructs based on administrative theory.

Those superintendents in the category of less than ten years' experience ranked this item fifteenth whereas those with over thirty years' experience, classed it as nineteenth.

Item 18. Involve a team of professors to work with an administrator in a school system over a period of a year or two.

Metropolitan superintendents ranked this item fourth. Superintendents with less than ten years' experience ranked it eleventh.

Item 19. Ask administrators to teach an occasional course or class period.

This item was ranked ninth by superintendents with less than ten years' experience and nineteenth by those with from twenty to thirty years' experience. Upstate superintendents ranked it eighteenth.

Item 20. Set up school visitation and post-visitation conferences with school administrators.

Although superintendents with less than ten years of experience rated this item sixth, it was rated eleventh by those with from twenty to thirty years' experience.

Question 3. Is the perception of professors and superintendents in New York State in agreement concerning the rank order of value of twenty ways for professors of educational administration to serve administrators as a total group and as sub-groups according to such factors as years of service, upstate or metropolitan location and professional participation in an institutional program preparing superintendents of schools?

Table III shows the total number of mailed materials and the total number of respondents. Two hundred and eighty sets of materials were mailed and two hundred eighteen responses were received. The table also shows the number of responses in each category. The item numbers are along the side of the page and refer to the twenty items in Figure 1, by the number of each item. The columns indicate the rank order of each item by category of professor.

In the following presentation the writer has discussed the findings related to Question 3 on the basis of total sample comparisons, years of experience, upstate and metropolitan groups and type of program in which professors are participating.

TABLE III
RANK ORDER OF PREFERENCE BY THE TOTAL GROUP

	Rank order total rating	Professors rating	Superintendents rating	Under 10 years experience	10-20 yrs. exp.	20-30 yrs. exp.	Over 30 yrs. exp.	Under 10 yrs. experience	10-20 yrs. exp.	20-30 yrs. exp.	Over 30 yrs. experience	Upstate professors	Metropolitan professors	Upstate Supts.	Metropolitan Supts.	Professors in universities with superintendency programs	Professors not in universities with superintendency programs
Mailed	280	140	140	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	101	39	101	39		
Returned	218	104	114	38	38	19	9	14	47	38	15	77	27	83	27	34	70
Question#																	
1*	2	4	3	4	5	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	6	2	5	8	2
2	17	17	16	17	18	18	14	12	15	16	17	15	19	16	14	17	19
3	12	11	15	12	10	8	9	17	17	12	7	11	9	15	15	13	9
4	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3	1	2	3	1	2	1
5	3	2	4	5	2	1	4	1	5	1	9	3	3	5	1	3	4
6	11	14	9	14	14	12	11	3	9	14	9	14	12	7	15	13	13
7	5	2	6	2	4	4	4	6	6	4	5	2	4	6	3	4	3
8	20	20	20	20	20	20	16	12	19	19	19	20	19	19	20	18	20
9	14	15	12	17	15	14	14	17	12	8	15	16	16	13	10	15	18
10	19	19	19	16	16	19	18	17	20	17	16	17	18	19	17	19	16
11	9	10	7	11	9	10	9	6	8	8	12	9	14	8	6	11	10
12	15	16	14	15	19	14	16	15	13	14	9	19	18	14	11	16	16
13	4	6	2	6	3	5	11	3	4	2	1	5	8	1	8	7	5
14	6	7	5	7	7	5	4	12	3	6	1	7	7	4	7	4	7
15	7	5	11	1	5	10	4	9	11	7	18	6	1	12	12	1	6
16	13	13	13	12	13	11	13	15	13	12	13	13	14	11	18	12	13
17	15	12	18	9	12	16	18	15	18	17	19	12	11	17	18	10	12
18	8	8	7	8	8	5	4	11	6	10	5	8	4	10	4	6	8
19	18	18	17	19	16	17	18	9	16	19	13	17	17	18	13	19	15
20	9	9	9	10	11	8	2	6	9	11	7	10	10	9	8	9	10

Responses of groups with less than ten years' experience:

Professors with less than ten years' experience tended to rate theory more highly than did other groups (Items 15, 17).

The young superintendents, under ten years, rated building a reference library, teaching an occasional course, providing consultant lists and issuing bulletins of information as more helpful than did professors or other superintendents (Items 2, 6, 11, 19). They looked with less favor than other groups upon setting up meetings of administrators within a system, providing for interns and involving professors to work with administrators (Items 3, 14, 18).

The less experienced professors were more favorable than the superintendents with less than ten years' experience to meetings for administrators from the same school system, involving administrators in practical research problems, providing administrative interns, studying the application of administrative theory and working out constructs based on administrative theory (Items 3, 7, 14, 15, 17). On the other hand the less experienced superintendents were more favorable than the less experienced professors to providing group conferences for administrators with similar administrative responsibilities, building a reference library, issuing bulletins of information, directed program of professional reading developing an area resource and consultant list, asking administrators to teach an occasional course and setting up visitation and post-visitation conferences (Items 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 19, 20).

Responses of groups with ten to twenty years' experience:

Professors in the ten to twenty year group gave a slightly higher rating to providing a personnel file of available young administrators than did the younger group (Item 9). They also had somewhat less confidence in the study of administrative theory (Items 15, 17).

The superintendents with ten to twenty years' experience were more favorable than the younger superintendents toward the following items: professors' speaking out in meetings, providing administrative interns, and the involving of professors in working with a school system (Items 12, 14, 18).

Professors with ten to twenty years of experience were more favorable than the comparable group of superintendents to meetings for administrators from the same school system, developing an area resource and consultant list, studying the application of administrative theory and working out theoretical constructs (Items 3, 11, 15, 17). Superintendents in this sub-group were more favorably impressed than the professors by bulletins of information, professors' speaking out at meetings and working with administrative interns (Items 6, 12, 14).

Responses of groups with twenty to thirty years of experience:

Professors in the twenty to thirty year group gave theory an even lower rating than did their younger counterparts (Items 15, 17). However, this group had relatively greater confidence in visitation and post-visitation conferences (Item 20).

Those superintendents with from twenty to thirty years' experience give a higher rating than younger superintendents to administrative committee meetings, to providing a file of employable young administrators and developing an area resource and consulting list (Items 5, 9). They rated teaching of a course much lower than superintendents in other age groups rated this item (Item 19).

Professors in the twenty to thirty year group were more favorable than the comparable superintendency group to holding meetings of administrators from the same system and to involving a team of professors to work with an administrator (Items 3, 18).

Superintendents were more impressed than the professors with providing a personnel file of employable young administrators.

Responses of groups with over thirty years' experience:

The professors with over thirty years of service had less confidence in study of administrative theory than other professorial age groups (Items 15, 17). In this respect they were much like the total group of superintendents. They tended to regard professional reading and school visitation more favorably than other professors (Item 2, 8, 20).

The superintendents with over thirty years of service were more favorable than other superintendents to setting up meetings of administrators within a system, setting up committees to improve practice, providing consultant service and providing interns (Items 3, 12, 13, 14). They tended to look with less favor upon teaching a course than did other administrators (Item 11).

Upstate and Metropolitan groups:

Upstate professors were more favorable than metropolitan professors to group conferences of administrators in similar positions, to building reference libraries, to involving administrators in research, to developing a resources and consultant list and to providing consultant services (Item 1, 2, 7, 11, 13).

Upstate superintendents when compared to metropolitan superintendents rated the following items higher: conferences of administrators with similar duties, bulletins of information, administrative and consultant lists, administrative interns and research service for writing grant proposals (Items 1, 6, 13, 14, 16).

Professors with over thirty years' experience ranked higher than did the more experienced superintendents such items as work with special purpose committees of administrators to improve practice, study of the application of administrative theory to situations, and school visitation conferences. (Items 5, 15, 20). On the other hand the superintendents of this sub-group were more favorable than the professors to having professors speak out at area meetings, providing individual consultant service and asking administrators to teach an occasional course (Items 12, 13, 19).

Responses of the Metropolitan groups:

Metropolitan professors rated the following items higher than did the upstate professors: speaking out in area meetings, applying administrative theory, and involving professors in working with a school system (Items 12, 15, 18).

Metropolitan superintendents were more favorable than upstate superintendents to cooperative evaluation teams, special purpose committees, involvement in practical research problems, personnel file of employable young administrators, consultant list, speaking out in meetings, involving professors to work with administrators and occasionally teaching a course (Items 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 18, 19).

Metropolitan professors were more favorable than metropolitan superintendents to setting up meetings for administrators from the same system, studying the application of administrative theory, providing a research service for writing grant proposals and working

out theoretical constructs. (Items 3, 15, 16, 17.) However, metropolitan superintendents ranked more favorably the building of a ready reference library, providing a personnel file of employable young administrators, developing an area administrative resource and consultant list and asking administrators to teach an occasional course or class period. (Items 2, 9, 11, 19.)

Responses of Upstate Groups:

Upstate professors ranked the following items higher than did metropolitan professors: building a ready reference library and developing an area resource and consultant list. (Items 2, 11.)

Upstate superintendents ranked higher than metropolitan superintendents such items as issuing bulletins of information and providing research service for grant writing proposals (Items 6, 16).

Upstate professors ranked higher than upstate superintendents such items as setting up meetings for administrators from the same system, involving administrators in practical theory and working out theoretical constructs. (Items 3, 7, 15, 17). The upstate superintendents were more favorable than the upstate professors to issuing bulletins of information, speaking out in area meetings and providing individual consultant services. (Items 6, 12, 13).

Responses of Professors by type of program:

Professors in universities offering preparation programs for superintendents appeared to be more favorable than other professors to studying the application of administrative theory to situations (Item 15).

Professors in universities not offering preparation programs for superintendents rated the following items somewhat higher than did other professors: conferences with administrators with similar responsibilities, meetings of administrators from the same school system, and asking administrators to teach an occasional course (Items 1, 3, 19).

Responses for the total sample:

Professors and superintendents were in general agreement as to the rank order of items in terms of helpfulness. In the total ratings, the items that included conferences and the exchange of ideas (Items 1, 3, 5, 8, 20) were slightly more favored than were items based on research and theory (Items 4, 7, 15, 16, 17). Those items dealing with reading and information (Items 2, 6,8, 12, 13) as well as those dealing with aid for the administrators (Items 9, 10, 11, 14, 19) were looked upon with less favor than those mentioned in the previous sentence.

The professors tended to rate as more important than did the superintendents such things as meetings of administrators from the same school system, involving practicing administrators in research problems of a practical nature, studying the application of administrative theory to situations and work with theoretical constructs based on administrative theory (Items 3, 7, 15, 17). On the other hand, the superintendents placed a higher rating than did the professors on issuing bulletins of information providing a personnel file of employable young administrators, developing an area administrative resource and consultant list and through providing individual consultant services for administrators. (Items 6, 9, 11, 13.)

Major Conclusions

While there was general agreement between professors and practicing administrators

on the rank order of the items, the results of the study tend to confirm the idea that perception differs between individuals and groups as they view a process from different environmental positions. The results seem to indicate that this is so even when the individuals have much that they hold in common but are employed in different environmental positions.

In general it seems fair to state that more experienced professors and superintendents tend to agree more fully than do less experienced professors and superintendents. If this trend is verified and continues, it may indicate an even sharper difference betwee superintendents and professors in the future. On the other hand it appears that the professors in metropolitan areas and in preparation programs offering the superintendency certificate tended to agree with the young professors on the value of theory. Since the thrust toward theory is relatively recent, it may indicate that there has been more opportunity for young professors, professors in metropolitan areas and professors in superintendency programs to learn more about the nature of administrative theory.

Recommendation for further study

Further study might be directed toward determining the reasons for discrepancies in points of view obtained. The study might well be compared to a national study to determine wherein the results were alike or different. (The writer is currently engaged in the suggested national study). A similar study might be made in five or ten years to see whether or not the patterns of perception have changed relative to in-service education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

6/14/66